



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

January 21, 2003

Mr. Gordon Bowman  
Assistant County Attorney  
Travis County  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2003-0395

Dear Mr. Bowman:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 175269.

The Travis County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received a request for "the number of people who have died in the custody of the Travis County Sheriff's department as well as their cause of death for this year and every year since 1990." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You contend that a portion of the submitted information must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 81.103 of the Health and Safety Code, which makes certain test result information confidential.<sup>1</sup> Section 81.103(a) provides:

A test result is confidential. A person that possesses or has knowledge of a test result may not release or disclose the test result or allow the test result to become known except as provided by this section.

"Test results" are defined as:

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes.

any statement that indicates that an identifiable individual has or has not been tested for AIDS or HIV infection, antibodies to HIV, or infection with any other probable causative agent of AIDS, including a statement or assertion that the individual is positive, negative, at risk, or has or does not have a certain level of antigen or antibody.

Health & Safety Code § 81.101(5). We do not believe the confidentiality provisions for AIDS test results apply when the patient is deceased. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-61 (1991); Open Records Decision No. 529 (1989). Consequently, section 81.103 of the Health and Safety Code does not apply to the submitted information.

We next address your argument that some of the submitted information is made confidential under common-law privacy.<sup>2</sup> Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). We note, however, that an individual's privacy rights lapse at that person's death. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979) ("action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded") (quoting Restatement of Torts 2d); *see generally* Attorney General Opinion H-917 at 3-4 (1976); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981). Because the submitted information pertains to deceased individuals, we conclude that it is not made confidential under common-law privacy.

Finally, you argue that "the privacy interests of the decedent's families should be considered with regard to the release of otherwise confidential information." If the release of information about a deceased person reveals highly intimate or embarrassing information about living persons, the information must be withheld under common-law privacy. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-229.

The constitutional right to privacy protects two interests. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992). The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.* The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters.

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right to privacy.

The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common-law; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5 (1987) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). After carefully reviewing the submitted information, we conclude that it does not contain information about the living family members of deceased individuals. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491 (right of privacy belongs to the "person about whom" facts have been published). As such, the family members' privacy interests are not implicated by the release of the submitted information. The sheriff therefore may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of common-law or constitutional privacy, and it must be released to the requestor in its entirety.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

  
V.G. Schimmel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

VGS/sdk

Ref: ID# 175269

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Claire Osborn  
Metro Reporter  
Austin American-Statesman  
P.O. Box 670  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(w/o enclosures)